UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,306	06/23/2000	Chris Pratley	13237-2570 (MS#142282.1)	1163

27488 7590 11/16/2005

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
BASEHOAR, ADAM L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/602,306	PRATLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam L. Basehoar	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 08/22/05.

2. Claim 31 has been added as necessitated by Amendment.

3. The rejection of claims 1, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.

4. Claims 1-9 and 11-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96).

5. Claim 10 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96) in further view of Oberteuffer et al (6,438,523 08/20/02).

6. Claims 1-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, and 20 are an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-9 and 11-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96).

-In regard to independent claim 1 and dependent claim 28, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) (Fig. 2A: 204) from said two or more text components (Fig. 2A: 202).

-Receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from two or more of the text components by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

-Receiving a command (Fig. 4: 418) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408 & 410) for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component in a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Determining if the displayed suggested alternative to the text was an acceptable alternative to the text unit (column 4, lines 50-60)(Fig. 4: 424).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

-Selecting an alternative from the revised list (column 4, lines 50-53)(Fig. 2A: 210) and replacing directly into the text document the selected alternative (Fig. 2B: 212).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

Miller et al do not specifically teach after displaying the list of alternatives, automatically displaying directly in the text document a suggested alternative to the text unit from the list. Miller et al do teach wherein the completion suggestions in the list were ordered based on the likelihood of being correct and initially placing the selection indicator at the top entry of the list (column 4, lines 48-50; column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-2). Miller et al also teach automatically predicting and replacing a text component (column 2, lines 35-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have automatically displayed directly in the text document a suggested alternative to the text unit, because Miller et al teach calculating a suggested alternative with the highest probability of being correct (column 4, lines 48-50; column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-2) and automatically including the suggested alternative (column 2, lines 35-52), which combined would provide the benefit of the highest probability of correction while saving the user keystrokes (column 4, lines 58-60).

Miller et al do not wherein in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, the erroneous text component was then submitted to a correction scope model to determine the scope of the correction and if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component and thus displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Newbold teaches wherein selecting an erroneous text component (column 3, lines 62-65: "detect error"), causes the text component to be submitted to a context sensitive correction scope model (Fig. 2: 150) (Which as noted in the Applicant's Specification (Page 8, lines 13-16), a correction

scope model could be a model of likely errors as detailed on in Newbold "broken words, doubled words, spacing, etc (column 4, lines 22-26)), wherein the context sensitive correction scope model determines if the scope of the model should be adjusted by viewing the error as best understood in the text in which it occurs (column 4, lines 22-24) and identifying the text unit (column 3, lines 64-66: "when an error is detected, an error unit is generated....detected error") which could include a identified text error and an adjacent text component (i.e. "double words" or "usage")(column 4, lines 16-30)(Fig. 5B: "all agree" "Never the less"). Newbold also teaches wherein the scope of the text component was not adjusted (i.e. not viewed in its context), communicating the error to display a list of alternatives (Fig. 3: 258, 262, 264). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have utilized the context sensitive correction scope model as shown in Newbold, because Newbold shows the benefit of correcting a plurality of common related erroneous text entries in a single step which would save the user of Miller et al the trouble of correcting each word one at a time (i.e. "double words", "Never the less" etc). In addition Newbold shows providing a better alternative to a user, for the erroneous input, for more efficient correction by incorporating the surrounding text meaning into the text replacement suggestion (column 4, lines 22-24).

-In regard to independent claim 13 and dependent claim 29, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component)(Fig. 2A: 204) from said two or more text components (Fig. 2A: 202).

-Receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from two or more of the text components by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

-Receiving a command (Fig. 4: 418) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408 & 410 for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component in a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Determining if the displayed suggested alternative to the text was an acceptable alternative to the text unit (column 4, lines 50-60)(Fig. 4: 424).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

-Continually filtering the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) by continuing to receive a character input (Fig. 4: 402) whenever an acceptance command (Fig. 4: 424) is not received because no suitable alternatives are selected. Miller et al further teach if in response to additional characters and further filtering, no alternative from the list is accepted (Fig. 4: 404), using the inputted word directly into the document (Fig.4).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

Miller et al do not specifically teach after displaying the list of alternatives, automatically displaying directly in the text document a suggested alternative to the text unit from the list. Miller et al do teach wherein the completion suggestions in the list were ordered

based on the likelihood of being correct and initially placing the selection indicator at the top entry of the list (column 4, lines 48-50; column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-2). Miller et al also teach automatically predicting and replacing a text component (column 2, lines 35-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have automatically displayed directly in the text document a suggested alternative to the text unit, because Miller et al teach calculating a suggested alternative with the highest probability of being correct (column 4, lines 48-50; column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-2) and automatically including the suggested alternative (column 2, lines 35-52), which combined would provide the benefit of the highest probability of correction while saving the user keystrokes (column 4, lines 58-60).

Miller et al do not wherein in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, the erroneous text component was then submitted to a correction scope model to determine the scope of the correction and if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component and thus displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Newbold teaches wherein selecting an erroneous text component (column 3, lines 62-65: "detect error"), causes the text component to be submitted to a context sensitive correction scope model (Fig. 2: 150) (Which as noted in the Applicant's Specification (Page 8, lines 13-16), a correction scope model could be a model of likely errors as detailed on in Newbold "broken words, doubled words, spacing, etc (column 4, lines 22-26)), wherein the context sensitive correction scope model determines if the scope of the model should be adjusted by viewing the error as best

understood in the text in which it occurs (column 4, lines 22-24) and identifying the text unit (column 3, lines 64-66: "when an error is detected, an error unit is generated....detected error") which could include a identified text error and an adjacent text component (i.e. "double words" or "usage")(column 4, lines 16-30)(Fig. 5B: "all agree" "Never the less"). Newbold also teaches wherein the scope of the text component was not adjusted (i.e. not viewed in its context), communicating the error to display a list of alternatives (Fig. 3: 258, 262, 264). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have utilized the context sensitive correction scope model as shown in Newbold, because Newbold shows the benefit of correcting a plurality of common related erroneous text entries in a single step which would save the user of Miller et al the trouble of correcting each word one at a time (i.e. "double words", "Never the less" etc). In addition Newbold shows providing a better alternative to a user, for the erroneous input, for more efficient correction by incorporating the surrounding text meaning into the text replacement suggestion (column 4, lines 22-24).

-In regard to independent claim 20 and dependent claim 30, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) (Fig. 2A: 204) from said two or more text components (Fig. 2A: 202).

-Receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from two or more of the text components by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

-Receiving a command (Fig. 4: 418) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408 & 410 for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component in a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Determining if the displayed suggested alternative to the text was an acceptable alternative to the text unit (column 4, lines 50-60)(Fig. 4: 424).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

- Identifying a completed alternative text component within the list of alternatives associated with the partial entry (Fig. 2A) and displaying the suggested matching completed text alternative component directly into the text document (Fig. 2A). Miller et al further teach receiving an acceptance command with the suggested completion (column 4, lines 50-55)(Fig. 2A) and in response to the acceptance command replacing directly into the document the matching completed alternative (Fig. 2B).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

Miller et al do not specifically teach after displaying the list of alternatives, automatically displaying directly in the text document a suggested alternative to the text unit from the list. Miller et al do teach wherein the completion suggestions in the list were ordered based on the likelihood of being correct and initially placing the selection indicator at the top entry of the list (column 4, lines 48-50; column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-2). Miller et al also teach

automatically predicting and replacing a text component (column 2, lines 35-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have automatically displayed directly in the text document a suggested alternative to the text unit, because Miller et al teach calculating a suggested alternative with the highest probability of being correct (column 4, lines 48-50; column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-2) and automatically including the suggested alternative (column 2, lines 35-52), which combined would provide the benefit of the highest probability of correction while saving the user keystrokes (column 4, lines 58-60).

Miller et al do not wherein in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, the erroneous text component was then submitted to a correction scope model to determine the scope of the correction and if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component and thus displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Newbold teaches wherein selecting an erroneous text component (column 3, lines 62-65: "detect error"), causes the text component to be submitted to a context sensitive correction scope model (Fig. 2: 150) (Which as noted in the Applicant's Specification (Page 8, lines 13-16), a correction scope model could be a model of likely errors as detailed on in Newbold "broken words, doubled words, spacing, etc (column 4, lines 22-26)), wherein the context sensitive correction scope model determines if the scope of the model should be adjusted by viewing the error as best understood in the text in which it occurs (column 4, lines 22-24) and identifying the text unit (column 3, lines 64-66: "when an error is detected, an error unit is generated....detected error")

which could include a identified text error and an adjacent text component (i.e. "double words" or "usage")(column 4, lines 16-30)(Fig. 5B: "all agree" "Never the less"). Newbold also teaches wherein the scope of the text component was not adjusted (i.e. not viewed in its context), communicating the error to display a list of alternatives (Fig. 3: 258, 262, 264). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have utilized the context sensitive correction scope model as shown in Newbold, because Newbold shows the benefit of correcting a plurality of common related erroneous text entries in a single step which would save the user of Miller et al the trouble of correcting each word one at a time (i.e. "double words", "Never the less" etc). In addition Newbold shows providing a better alternative to a user, for the erroneous input, for more efficient correction by incorporating the surrounding text meaning into the text replacement suggestion (column 4, lines 22-24).

-In regard to dependent claims 2, and 21, Miller et al teach continually filtering the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) by continuing to receive a character input (Fig. 4: 402) whenever an acceptance command (Fig. 4: 424) is not received because no suitable alternatives are selected. Miller et al further teach if in response to additional characters and further filtering, no alternative from the list is accepted (Fig. 4: 404), using the inputted word directly into the document and closing the user interface (Fig. 4: 428).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Miller et al teach identifying a completed alternative text component within the list of alternatives associated with the partial entry (Fig. 2A) and displaying the suggested matching completed text alternative component directly into the text

document (Fig. 2A). Miller et al further teach receiving an acceptance command with the suggested completion (column 4, lines 50-55)(Fig. 2A) and in response to the acceptance command replacing directly into the document the matching completed alternative (Fig. 2B) and closing the user interface (Fig. 2B).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 14, and 22, Miller et al teach wherein typing a first character of the selected alternative (Fig.4: 402) directly into the text document (Fig. 2A&B), wherein it would be inherent that the addition of text characters (Fig. 4: 402) would be at the location of the text component because otherwise the word's components would not be symmetric in the document and unnecessarily difficult to read.

-In regard to dependent claims 5-6, 8, 15, and 23, Miller at al teach wherein the text input (selection) into a data file (text document) could include stochastic input sources such as a voice recognition and a hand-writing recognition device (column 1, lines 22-34).

-In regard to dependent claims 7, 9, 16-17, 24-25, Miller et al teach wherein the text input (selection) into a data file (text document) could include stochastic input sources such as a voice recognition and a hand-writing recognition device (column 1, lines 22-34). Miller et al also teach being able to input one character at a time (Fig. 4: 402) and as stated above in claims 4, 14, and 22 it would have been inherent that the addition of text characters (Fig. 4: 402) would be at the location of the text component because otherwise the word's components would not be symmetric in the document and unnecessarily difficult to read.

-In regard to dependent claims 11-12, 18-19, and 26-27, Miller et al teach a computer system and a computer readable medium having computer executable code (Fig. 1: 20).

-In regard to dependent claim 31, wherein the suggested alternative to the text unit was displayed in the text document in a reverse video presentation (column 12, lines 66-67; column 13, lines 1-6: "reverse-color convention").

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96) in further view of Oberteuffer et al (6,438,523 08/20/02).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, neither Miller et al nor Newbold teach wherein one of the stochastic text input devices is a vision-based recognition device for recognizing gestures. Oberteuffer et al teach multiple stochastic text inputs (Abstract) as well as a gesture interface for text input (Fig. 9: 902:904)(column 7, lines 44-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for at the time of the invention, for Miller et al to have utilized Oberteuffer et al gesture input device for inputting text, because it would have allowed users unable to use the speech to text of Miller et al to input text using sign language or other well known gestures.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 08/22/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 13, and 20, Applicant argues that Miller et al fail to teach or suggest the newly amended limitations of automatically displaying directly in the data file a suggested word prediction. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. As discussed above in the rejection of the claims, Miller et al clearly teaches displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Miller et al also teach wherein a user can select an alternative from the list of alternatives to be displayed directly in the document. The Examiner agrees that Miller et al do not specifically teach automatically displaying a suggested alternative, from the list, in the text document. However Miller et al do teach ranking the displayed list of alternatives based on a likelihood of correctness (i.e. highest probability) as well as teach in past alternative suggesting methods automatically displaying in the document a suggested alternative to reduce the number of keystrokes entered by a user. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for, Miller et al to have automatically inserted the suggestion with the highest probability of correctness to reduce the number of inputs. Newly cited reference, Potter (US-6,131,102), also provides an example of automatically displaying the best alternative in the document (column 3, 34-42).

Applicant also argues that Miller et al fail to teach or suggest receiving selection of an erroneous data entry from the one or more entries of a text selection. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Miller et al clearly teach receiving a text selection input of a text string into a document, wherein the text string comprised two or more text components (Fig. 2A: 202). Miller et al also teach from said text selection input string, selecting an erroneous text component

(Fig. 2A: 204) by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

Applicant further argues that Miller et al fail to teach submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model. The Examiner believes that the Miller at al reference in view of the Newbold reference teach said limitations.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-6,131,102 10-2000 Potter, Douglas

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER